

PATENT

C. REMARKS

Summary of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 16-19, and 21-23 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 15, and 20 have been cancelled and
5 claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 16-19, 21, and 23 have been amended. No claims have been added. Claims 1, 8, 14, and 19 are independent claims.

Original claims 3, 7, 15, 18, 20, and 23 were deemed allowable and the remaining claims were rejected under
10 U.S.C. § 103. The independent claims have been amended to include limitations originally found in allowable claims 3, 15, and 20.

Double Patenting

15 Claims 1, 8, 10, 11, 14, and 19-20 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 7 of U.S. Patent 6,661,432. Enclosed herewith is a terminal disclaimer, signed by Applicants' undersigned registered
20 attorney. In light of Applicants' terminal disclaimer, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the double patenting rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

25 Applicants note with appreciation that original claims 3, 7, 15, 18, 20, and 21 were objected to as depending upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten

PATENT

in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended the independent claims to include the limitations of allowable claims. In particular, claims 1 and 8 have
5 been amended to include limitations originally found in allowable claim 3, and claim 3 has been cancelled. Likewise, independent claim 14 has been amended to include limitations originally found in allowable claim 15, and claim 15 has been cancelled. Independent claim 19 has been
10 amended to include limitations originally found in allowable claim 20, and claim 20 has been cancelled.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of Applicants' independent claims has been amended to include limitations found to be allowable in the Office Action.
15 Therefore, each of Applicants' independent claims, as amended, is in a condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

The Office Action notes that claims 15-18 appear to be
20 dependent on claim 14 but were originally listed as being dependent on claim 13. Applicants have cancelled claim 15, as outlined above, and amended claims 16-18 so that each of these claims is listed as being dependent on claim 14, rather than claim 13.

25 The Office Action also notes that "Claims 20-23 appear to be dependent on claim 19 but are listed as being dependent on claim 19." Upon review, original claims 20-23 were listed as being dependent on claim 18, and should have been listed as being dependent on claim 19. Applicants

PATENT

have cancelled claim 20, as outlined above, and have amended claims 21-23 so that each of these claims is listed as being dependent on claim 19, rather than claim 18.

In light of Applicants' amendments, Applicants believe
5 that the claims are no longer objectionable and respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's objections in light of such amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

10 Original claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-14, 16-17, 19, and 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,253,198 to Perkins in view of a document from Google™ published September 21, 1999 entitled "Googles New GoogleScout Feature Expands
15 Scope of Search on the Internet," (hereinafter "Google"). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Netscape's "Netscape Navigator Gold Version 3.01," (hereinafter "Netscape").

Applicants have amended each of the independent claims
20 1, 8, 14, and 19 to include the limitations found to be allowable in original claims 3, 15, and 20. As a result, Applicants' independent claims are allowable over Perkins in view of Google.

Claims 2, and 4-7 each depend on allowable independent
25 claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason. In addition, original dependent claim 7 was found to be independently allowable in the Office Action.

PATENT

Claims 9-13 each depend, directly or indirectly, on allowable independent claim 8, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 16-18 each depend on allowable independent claim 14 and are each allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 14 is allowable. In addition, original dependent claim 18 was found to be independently allowable in the Office Action.


Finally, claims 21-23 each depend on allowable independent claim 19 and are each allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 19 is allowable. In addition, original dependent claim 23 was found to be independently allowable in the Office Action.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Joseph T. Van Leeuwen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,383
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742